

The Office action also alleged that the foregoing claim features are not supported by the specification. That is incorrect.

For example, FIG. 1F (submitted with the RCE dated January 9, 2006) shows an insulating film 62 covering a bridge 53 that is exposed within the insulating resin 61. Further support for those features can be found, for example, at page 8, lines 17-18 of the specification as originally filed, which states (in connection with FIG. 1D) that "the rear surface of the semiconductor device is covered with the insulating [film] 62 so that only the areas of the O marks 92 may be exposed."

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under section 112.

Drawing Objections

The Office action objected to the drawings for not showing all the features of claim 4 and, in particular, a bridge exposed within a recess and whose rear surface is covered by an insulating film. As discussed above, in view of FIG. 1F, that is incorrect. FIG. 1F clearly shows an insulating film 62 covering a rear surface of bridge 53 that is exposed from insulating resin 61.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 23 and 28 were rejected as unpatentable over Lin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,273,938) in view of Fjelstad (U.S. Patent No. 6,001,671). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

Claim 4 recites a rear surface of a bridge that is recessed relative to a rear surface of an insulating resin and is covered by an insulating film. An example of that is illustrated in FIG. 1F of the pending application in which the rear surface of the bridge 53 is recessed relative to the rear surface of the insulating resin 61 and is covered by the insulating film 62.

The Office action interprets the Lin et al. patent in inconsistent ways to find the claimed features in that reference. However, neither the Lin et al. patent, the Fjelstad patent nor any combination thereof discloses or suggests those features.

In particular, the Lin et al. patent does not disclose or suggest a rear surface of a bridge that is recessed relative to a rear surface of an insulating resin, as recited in claim 4. That is so even if the encapsulating resin 20 and the transfer film 12 (FIG. 1 of the Lin et al. patent) were considered to correspond, respectively, to the claimed "insulating resin" and the "insulating film" of pending claim 4. Under such an interpretation, the rear surface of the conductive trace 13 (which, according to the Office action, allegedly corresponds to the claimed "bridge" of pending claim 4) is not recessed relative to the rear surface of the encapsulating resin 20. Instead, the rear surface of the conductive trace 13 is flush with the rear surface of encapsulating resin 20.

Page 6, line 8 of the Office action suggests a different interpretation of the Lin et al. patent, in which both the encapsulating resin 20 and transfer film 12 together correspond to the claimed insulating resin. Under such an interpretation, the claimed "insulating film" would be lacking entirely.

Nor does the Fjelstad patent disclose or suggest a rear surface of a bridge that is recessed relative to a rear surface of an insulating resin, as recited in claim 4. The Fjelstad patent merely discloses a semiconductor package that includes a semiconductor chip 120' formed on a sacrificial polymer sheet 100'. Portions of the polymer sheet 100' are removed so that pads 110' and a central conductive region 115' are exposed (*See* FIG. 2A-2E, col. 5, lines 46-48).

Claim 4 should be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claim 4 also should be allowable for the following reasons.

The Office action alleges that a person of ordinary skill would have considered it obvious to remove portions of Lin et al.'s transfer film 12 in the same way that portions of Fjelstad's polymer sheet 100' are removed. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As shown in FIG. 2 of the Lin patent, the entire transfer film 12 is eventually removed from the semiconductor device so that die 21 and wire bonds 18 may be attached. It would not have made sense to remove portions of the film 12 because the Lin patent expressly discloses that the entire film 12 eventually is to be removed.

Claims 23 and 28 depend on claim 4 and, therefore, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 4

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.


Applicant : Noriaki Sakamoto et al.
Serial No. : 09/821,361
Filed : March 29, 2001
Page : 5 of 5

Attorney's Docket No.: 10417-074001 / F51-
129328M/SW

Enclosed is a check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/11/06



Samuel Borodach
Reg. No. 38, 388

Fish & Richardson P.C.
Citigroup Center
52nd Floor
153 East 53rd Street
New York, New York 10022-4611
Telephone: (212) 765-5070
Facsimile: (212) 258-2291